

d. Remarks

Information Disclosure Statements

On Dec. 9, 2004, Examiner Lugo telephonically informed Mr. McCabe that U.S. Patent 5,953,376 was crossed out on the Information Disclosure Statement received by the US Patent & Trademark Office on July 03, 2002, because the same patent had been considered in relation to an earlier filed Information Disclosure Statement.

Restriction Requirement

Applicant affirms his election to prosecute Group I, i.e., claims 1 – 19.

Amendments to Claims

Applicant amends claim 1 to incorporate original claim 3 therein. Though not needed for patentability, Applicant further amends claim 1 to more clearly and distinctly point out his invention. Said further amendments are, e.g., supported at page 10, lines 3 – 28.

Applicant amends claim 9 to incorporate original claim 14 therein. Though not needed for patentability, Applicant further amends claim 1 to more clearly and distinctly point out his invention. Said further amendments are, e.g., supported at page 7, lines 12-19; and page 10, lines 3 – 28.

Drawing Objections

Applicant requests that the Examiner approve amendments to Figures on original Sheets 1, 2, and 14. The amendments add text labels to Figures 1, 2, and 10. With regard to the text labels:

- A) The text labels of Figure 1 conform the original description at page 4, lines 11 – 16;
- B) The text labels of Figure 2 conform to the original description between page 4, line 22, page 6, line 8, and page 7, line 20 – 21; and
- C) The text labels of Figure 10 conform to the original description at page 15.

The amendments to the drawings also remove reference numeral 50 from Figure 2. In light of above amendments, Applicants request that the Examiner approve the amended

Figures as shown on the attached three Replacement Sheets.

Claim Objections and Rejections

At page 6, the Office Action states that original claim 3 is allowable. Thus, amended claim 1, which incorporates original dependent claims 3, should be allowable.

Dependent claims 2 and 4 – 8 should be allowable, at least, by their dependence on base amended claim 1.

At page 6, the Office Action states that original claim 14 is allowable. Thus, amended claim 9, which incorporates original dependent claim 14, should be allowable.

Dependent claims 10 – 13 and 15 – 19 should be allowable, at least, by their dependence on base amended claim 9.

In light of the above remarks, the remaining rejections of the claims are moot.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, Applicants request allowance of claims 1 – 2, 4 – 13, and 15 – 19 as presently pending.

In the event of any non-payment or improper payment of a required fee, the Commissioner is authorized to charge or to credit **Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No. 12-2325** to correct the error.

Respectfully,



John F. McCabe, Reg. No. 42,854
Telephone: 908-582-6866

Date: Dec. 15, 2004

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Docket Administrator

101 Crawfords Corner Road (Rm. 3J-219)

Holmdel, New Jersey 07733